



Ten Commandments Of The Price System

f. o. b. Anywhere On Earth

By the Peripatetic Technocrat

In the November-December, 1947, issue of Great Lakes Technocrat the ten commandments of the Price System were enumerated. Evidence was presented to show how the System obeys its First and Second Commandments. In the last issue, January-February, 1948, the Third Commandment was illustrated. This installment deals with the Fourth Commandment of the Price System. It is: "Keep the political three-ring circus (executive-legislative-judicial) going full blast so as to divert attention from the scientific approach to social problems."

Biggest Circus on Earth

The great American three-ring circus (executive - legislative - judicial) first started to perform in the 'mind' of a 17th Century French philosopher, Charles Louis de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755). He formulated the theory of separating the powers of government into these three compartments. Our 'great American idea of checks and balances' in Government, like the ancient Price System, was imported from Europe.

Montesquieu stole many of his ideas from John Bodin (1530-1596); John Locke (1632-1704); and Giambattista Vico (1688-1744). They were all philosophers and they all lived and died before the steam engine was invented. Montesquieu did not even give his precursors credit for the ideas he stole from them. In his book *The Spirit of The Laws*, in which he expounded his social fictions, he went so far as to write on the title page these words: 'Offspring Born Without A Mother.'

Since nothing in this physical world is born without a mother, we are forced to conclude that Montesquieu wove his theories out of thin air. That is about where he got them from. Representative government, in which the sovereign power resides in the legislature, was unknown in any important state prior to the revolution of 1688 in England. Thus, his conclusion could not have been based upon any observable phenomena. They were philosophical abstractions. However, this is exactly what the ancient Price System is always looking for, to bolster its superstructure.

Most of the ideologies by which the Price System operates are abstractions. They have little or no connection with the means whereby men live, or the physical relation between those means and the host of social problems arising from them. This attachment to philosophical fictions is a routine part of Price System operations. It is necessary to have social myths for the great mass of people to believe in, to keep them from noticing the actual operations of the System.

They Knew What They Wanted

Among the greatest of these myths in America is the idea that separating the powers of government into three compartments operates in some mysterious way to advance the General Welfare of all citizens. Montesquieu held that this was the only way to secure 'liberty.' He didn't specify what kind of liberty. However, the rising commercial classes of the day saw the point. He meant their kind of liberty. Montesquieu's social fiction was appropriated and put into use. The 'Founding Fathers' of the U. S. knew well what they were about when sitting in the secret and illegal Constitutional Convention of 1789, they wove Montesquieu's philosophy into the governmental structure of these United States.

Here's what James Madison, 'Father of the American Constitution,' and fourth President of the U. S., wrote in the tenth number of the *Federalist* during the battle over ratification of the Constitution:

The first object of government is the protection of the diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate . . . the regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal tasks of modern legislation. The most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. . . . A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations and divide them into different classes actuated by different sentiments and views . . . What are the different classes of legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine. The causes of factions cannot be removed, we know from experience that neither moral nor religious motives can be relied upon as an adequate control.

To this Alexander Hamilton added:

. . . every institution calculated to restrain the excess of lawmaking and to keep things in the same state in which they happen to be at any given period was more likely to do good than harm.

'One Out of Many'

The idea, of both Madison and Hamilton evidently seems to have been to preserve the status quo. In order to reach this objective, the new constitution had been designed for that purpose. It was; and here's how they did it.

Charles A. Beard writes in his '*Rise of American Civilization*' that:

A few days after they had formally organized on May 3 (1789) the delegates solemnly adopted in the committee of the whole a momentous resolution "that a national government ought to be established consisting of a supreme legislative, executive and judiciary."

There were other possible styles of parliamentary government that might have been chosen. The self-appointed 'fathers of the Constitution' chose the tripod type for the following reasons, as stated by Beard:

Madison foresaw a time, not far distant, when the great mass of the people would be without landed or any other kind of property, when in spite of all precautions a triumphant majority might get possession of the political machine and make it an

engine of their purposes to the detriment of the public good, that is, in the main to the detriment of private property.

Beard states that the delegates were frightened by this specter of democracy.' Large property qualifications were proposed for suffrage and the holding of high federal offices. This idea was warmly received but had to be abandoned because 'If each voter or officer was required to possess a large amount of personal property, such as stocks and bonds, then the existing voters, two-thirds of whom were farmers, would not ratify an instrument that disfranchised them.'

'Open Covenants, Openly Arrived At'

It is necessary to remember in all this that the Constitutional Convention was a secret and illegal body of speculators and wealthy property owners, trying to slip something over on the new nation. 'None of the fiery radicals of 1774 was present,' states Beard. Thomas Jefferson was serving as Ambassador in Paris. Samuel Adams was not elected as a delegate. Tom Paine was in Europe demonstrating an iron bridge he had designed. Patrick Henry was chosen, but refused to serve because, as he said, he 'smelt a rat.' He certainly had a good nose.

The Convention was not only secret and illegal but, in addition, no delegate was permitted to give out any information about the proceedings. No official record of the debates was kept. So, we do not know what the other side had to say. However, the record shows that 62 delegates were chosen by the States, but only 39 signed the final draft of the new constitution. Beard states that:

In their anxiety for security the delegates took every precaution against publicity ...If a few members, particularly James Madison, had not made notes of the speeches, delivered in the Convention, posterity would never have discovered the real spirit that animated the discussions. And it was not until more than half a century later — after Madison, the last surviving member, had died and his private papers were published — that Americans got a clear insight into the proceedings of the great assembly that had drafted their revered Constitution.

Now, let's get back to our story. After the proposal for large property and wealth qualifications had been abandoned, it was proposed to establish a landed qualification for voting and holding office. This, too, had to be scrapped because bitter experience had shown that it was always the farmers who had sent 'radicals to the state legislatures and waged the war on the money lenders, merchants, and other holders of personal property.'

Machiavelli To The Rescue

After finding that every proposal advanced for organizing the government contained too much danger for the blessed minority, the delegates finally hit upon a solution. They sent Charles Louis de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, to bat for 'good old free enterprise.' Montesquieu knocked out a home run with the bases loaded.

Beard states that:

Finding that course barred, the delegates chose another way of dissolving the energy of the democratic majority. They broke its strength at the source by providing diverse methods for electing the agencies of the new government and threw special barriers in its path by setting those agencies, with their several ambitions, prerogatives, and insignia, at cross purposes. In short, the Fathers created a system of 'checks and balances,' dividing the power of government among legislative, executive, and judicial branches with confused and uncertain boundaries. All the world has marveled at their dexterity.

Yes, Sir! You have to give them credit. They were a slick bunch of free enterprisers, those 'Fathers' of our great Constitution. Their legerdemain with the pure fiction dreamed up by Montesquieu endures to this day. There is not a free enterpriser in the land who does not pretend to a staunch belief in the Constitution as it is said to be. Likewise, there is not a smart free enterpriser in the land who does not know the real purpose behind the great American three-ring circus. That is, what it actually is.

Howard Scott, Director-in-Chief of Technocracy Inc., has observed in *The Evolution of Statesmanship* that:

In the past 200 years, the political leaders of the Occidental world have based their policies on the general proposition that the appearance of acceptance of a popular belief was as necessary as an actual belief in it was harmful. The road to political power of today and yesterday has been paved with the apparent sincerity of all political leaders in immediate popular objectives. combined with the charming cynicism of total inaction toward any objectives save their own, namely, the acquisition of the power to administer politically and maintain the status quo of a scarcity economy just enough so that they can take their rake-off from the general drag-down.

His Majesty, The Voter

After all, why not? Whose system of society do you think this is? In other words, who is boss around here? The people? Guess again, brother! We are all existing under the tyranny and regimentation of the ancient (and lousy) Price System of Trade and Commerce. How else could it behave? It must have myths incorporated into its social structure to conceal its flimsy foundations and shoddy construction. The myths of the Price System are many. Most of them are beautiful and appealing on the outside. They have to be. On the inside, however, they are empty. They have to be that way, too.

Harry Elmer Barnes writes in his book *Social Institutions* as follows:

A general and popular superstition in regard to the American government is that the individual citizen is able to advance his interests and make his opinion felt in governmental matters. In other words, the government is supposed to be directly representative of the mass of citizens. Those who have made even an elementary study of the processes of American government in the last fifty years know that this conception is only a pious aspiration. It has been very difficult for any citizen or any small group of public-spirited citizens directly to exert effective pressure upon any governmental organization.

Legislation can usually be secured only through advance negotiations with, and approval by, the boss and the machine. Instead of direct government, we have built what has been frequently called the "invisible government," which controls most phases of American political life.

That is exactly why the system of 'checks and balances' was adopted. It checks the majority from making any inroads upon the age-old Price System privileges of the blessed minority. At the same time, it balances (more or

less) the conflicting claims and pressures of the groups making up that minority.

Science or Futility

Let us not allow him to escape. No matter how good or bad the government or constitution may be, the General Welfare of all citizens can never be realized under a Price System. Among others, there are two excellent reasons for this. The first is the ancient Price System itself. It is a type of social system organized specifically for the benefit of the blessed minority.

The other reason is that the political method, as such, of reaching social decisions conducive to the General Welfare is futile. It is not a question of parties. It is a question of methods. A skilled carpenter can build a better dog house than a wood butcher. Even a skilled carpenter, however, using the tools of his trade, cannot build and operate an intricate technological mechanism. It's that way with the political method under a Price System. It is a tool, or method, with which to build doghouses for the General Welfare. The modern American social problem is not how to get just a little better dog house than we now have. It is a problem of how to erect a new technological civilization. That is what is required, if we want to realize the General Welfare of all citizens.

For that job the political method is futile. It requires the scientific method, the scientific approach to social problems. Howard Scott, in *Science and Society*, has observed as follows:

Here on this Continent where science has achieved its greatest application, where technology has driven these developments to greater heights than in any other part of the world - here on this Continent, Science is in conflict with society. Science and technology have gone so far that the present social structure of the North American Continent is facing its debacle, its elimination.

The people of this Continent are avid for more scientific and technological information. The application of science in its technological developments is the greatest news and pictorial presentation of the day. The people of this Continent want more

science and more technology. They want it now, and not in some far distant mythical future.

Science has nothing in common with democracy, fascism, or communism. Science is antithetical to the moral philosophies of chiseling that underlie these premises of social conduct.

'Let Not Thy Left Hand Know—'

To put it another way, the scientific approach to social problems is now able to do what the age-old political, moral, philosophical approaches could never do. Therefore, a campaign of silence was put into effect by the 'free press' of America in regard to the social aspects of science. You may subscribe to every periodical in the good old U.S A., (about 20,000) and pore over them until your bifocals burst, and you will find little or no mention of the social aspect of science. In fact, it is hardly even intimated that science has any social aspect. Maybe it's a top secret.

However, just grab any old sheet on any old newsstand, and you'll find it plastered full of political, financial and commercial 'news.' There will be straight faced accounts galore of the moral endeavors of sincere damn fools to deodorize some of the worst stinks of the Price System. The philosophical speculations (in vacuo) of stuffed shirts also get a big play in our great 'free press.'

The movies do an able job along the same line. The radio blasts it out ceaselessly night and day. Even that little red schoolhouse, so dear in our memory, dishes out the same thin soup. College professors, bankers, lawyers, economists, politicians, business men, gangsters, and even the hardly less dim-witted unfortunates incarcerated in asylums all sing the same songs.

Any and every school of futility, from the pyramidologists to the social rationalizations of the National Association of Manufacturers, gets its due quota of publicity in the American Price System. Scarcely any drivel is barred, as long as the driveler can pay his way in dollars and cents. When it comes to

the social aspect of science, however, an eery silence descends upon the System.

The presses are still. The radio is silent. The movies are blank. The sincere damn fools draw back into their shells. The philosophers flutter from nowhere to nowhere. The professors take off to gather posies in the wildwood. The bankers juggle columns of figures to prove it can't be done. The economists trot forth Adam Smith. The politicians go into a caucus and count noses. The gangsters make hay while the Price System sun is shining. The lawyers sweat before the bar (which bar?) proving with Exhibits A to Z, inclusive, that the social aspect of science is unconstitutional.

While, amidst all this organized confusion, one sound rings clear and unmistakable above the uproar. Like a metronome, it beats the time in a kind of rhythmic rhyme. It sets the pace and calls the tune. That sound is the tinkle of the business man's cash register in the House of Good Old Free Enterprise.

Yea, verily! Thou must, always keep the great American three-ring circus going full blast so as to divert attention from the scientific approach to social problems.

Technocracy Incorporated - Great Lakes Technocrat - March/April 1948

<http://archive.org/details/GreatLakesTechnocrat-MarchApril1948>